

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

<del></del>	<del>                                     </del>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,966	11/26/2003	Martin Dionne	71624 CCD	9523
7590 12/28/2007 Christopher C. Dunham c/o Cooper & Dunham LLP 1185 Ave. of the Americas New York, NY 10036			EXAMINER	
			LEADER, WILLIAM T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE .	DELIVERY MODE
			12/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/723,966	DIONNE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	William T. Leader	1795				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
,— ,	)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 October 2007</u> .					
	·					
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-8 and 21 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-8 and 21 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> </ul>						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and all accomposed are specified any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some color None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(c)						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/25/2007.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number:

10/723,966

Art Unit: 1795

## **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 1, 2007, has been entered.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. Claims 1-8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Bergeron et al (CA 2 350 814 A1) and Townsend (5,227,045) for the reasons of record and in view of the following comments.
- 4. Applicant's Remarks have been carefully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive. At page 3 of the Remarks, applicant argues that the admitted prior art does not teach the combination of sufficient TiB<sub>2</sub> to make the surface wettable by aluminum with any additive. This argument is not convincing. In the Background of the Invention portion of the specification, it is stated that "It has been known for

10/723,966

Art Unit: 1795

a number of years that cathodes can be made from a composite of a carbon-containing component and a metal boride, such as titanium diboride (TiB<sub>2</sub>). The TiB<sub>2</sub> helps to protect the cathode against erosion and oxidation and makes the cathode wettable to aluminum." Thus, the admitted prior art does recognize the inclusion of sufficient TiB<sub>2</sub> to make the surface wettable. As indicated in the previous office action, Townsend shows that the amount of TiB<sub>2</sub> required to make the cathode wettable is known. Applicant argues that Bergeron discloses an amount of TiB<sub>2</sub> that is less than the amount required to make the carbonaceous material wettable by molten aluminum. While this may be correct, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to determine the amount of TiB<sub>2</sub> necessary to achieve wettability. Bergeron shows that it is recognized that the cathode may be made by mixing TiB<sub>2</sub> and additives which are precursors of TiB<sub>2</sub>.

5. At page 4 of the Remarks, applicant argues that Bergeron et al provide substantially all the titanium diboride in the form of precursors which are reacted cost in situ so as to maximize exact savings. The admitted prior art shows that all TiB2 may be provided as TiB2, while Bergeron shows that most of the TiB2 may be formed from precursors in situ with a smaller amount of TiB2 being supplied directly. Choice of an amount of TiB2 between these two recognized values would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. By using an amount of additives less than the maximum, some amount of savings would have still been achieved.

Page 4

Application/Control Number:

10/723,966

Art Unit: 1795

- 6. At the bottom of page 4 of the Remarks, applicant discussed the Declaration under 37 C.F.R.§1.132. The Declaration is insufficient to overcome the rejection of the claims as set forth in the last Office action because it is not commensurate in scope with the claimed subject matter. The declaration includes one example corresponding to the claimed subject matter. The example utilized a single additive at a single concentration. In the example, a cathode was made from carbon-based material containing 35wt% TiB<sub>2</sub> and a stoichiometrical mixture of TiO<sub>2</sub>/B<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> equivalent to 15wt%. However, claim 1 recites an additive consisting of a combination of two intimately mixed compounds but does not specify what the compounds are. Additionally, claim 1 recites that the additive is present in an amount up to 25% by weight. Claim 1 is of a scope greater than that of applicant's evidence.
- 7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Application/Control Number:

10/723,966

Art Unit: 1795

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William T. Leader whose telephone number is 571-272-1245. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays and alternate Fridays, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Susy Tsang-Foster can be reached on 571-272-1293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>.

Application/Control Number:

10/723,966

Art Unit: 1795

Page 6

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W-

William Leader December 20, 2007

SUSY TSANG-FOSTER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER